

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated September 17, 2004, please consider the following remarks.

In the Office Action issued September 17, 2004, claims 1-2, 6-7, 17-18, 33-34, and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,619,688 to Bosworth et al. (Bosworth). Claims 11-16 and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,363,391 to Rosensteel, Jr. (Rosensteel). Claims 3-5, 8-10, 19-21, 35-37, and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosworth in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0051939 to Yoshimura et al. (Yoshimura). Claims 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosworth in view of Rosensteel.

Claims 1-42 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, 28, and 33 have been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter that the inventor considers to be the invention.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 1-2, 6-7, 17-18, 33-34, and 38-39 is not anticipated by Bosworth. Bosworth discloses a method and system for constructing queries which make changes to an entire set of data stored in a database. However, Bosworth provides no disclosure or suggestion of trend analysis, or of any use or type of trend analysis. By contrast, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires creating or updating a database table that is suitable for trend analysis, the database table comprising information upon which trend

analysis is to be performed and information that is generated in order to perform the trend analysis. Bosworth provides no disclosure or suggestion of this required claim element.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 17 and 33, which are similar to claim 1, and according to claims 2, 6-7, 18, 34, and 38-39, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Bosworth.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 11-16 and 22-27 is not anticipated by Rosensteel. Rosensteel discloses an Application Programming Interface (API) that provides interoperability between different monitoring and administrative components of a data warehouse system that utilizes different standard protocols. Rosensteel discloses standard components of such a system (col. 4, lines 16-31), but does not disclose or suggest trend analysis or any relation of trend analysis to the disclosed API. By contrast, the present invention requires, for example, according to claim 11, a cover layer between the database connectivity layer component and the database application operable to capture and implement invocations by the database application of functions included in database connectivity layer component that may involve trend analysis, but pass through to the database connectivity layer component invocations by the database application of functions that do not involve trend analysis. Rosensteel provides no disclosure or suggestion of trend analysis or of this cover layer that functions based on the involvement of the database connectivity layer with trend analysis.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 11, and according to claim 22, which is similar to claim 11, and according to claims 12-16 and 23-27, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Rosensteel.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 3-5, 8-10, 19-21, 35-37, and 40-42 is not unpatentable over Bosworth in view of Yoshimura because even if Bosworth and Yoshimura were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result would not be the present invention as claimed. As the Examiner states, Bosworth does not specifically teach the use of a timestamp. In addition, neither Bosworth nor Yoshimura discloses or suggests trend analysis, or any use or type of trend analysis. Thus, the combination of Bosworth and Rosensteel still does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature, found in claim 1, from which claims 3-5 and 8-10 depend, claim 17, from which claims 19-21 depend, and claim 33, from which claims 35-37 and 40-42 depend, of creating or updating a database table that is suitable for trend analysis, the database table comprising information upon which trend analysis is to be performed and information that is generated in order to perform the trend analysis.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 3-5, 8-10, 19-21, 35-37, and 40-42 is not unpatentable over Bosworth in view of Yoshimura.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 28-32 is not unpatentable over Bosworth in view of Rosensteel because even if Bosworth and Rosensteel were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result would not be the present invention as claimed. Neither Bosworth nor Yoshimura discloses or suggests

trend analysis, or any use or type of trend analysis. Thus, the combination of Bosworth and Rosensteel still does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature, for example, according to claim 28, of creating or updating a database table that is suitable for trend analysis, the database table comprising information upon which trend analysis is to be performed and information that is generated in order to perform the trend analysis.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 28, and according to claims 29-32, which depend therefrom, is not unpatentable over Bosworth in view of Rosensteel.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.


Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0063).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael A. Schwartz", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: January 13, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500